

REMARKS

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103 or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 2-5, and 7-9, amended claims 1, 6, 10, and 11, and new claims 12-14 are in this application.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) unpatentable over Sadakuni (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,056) in view of Holm et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,260,016) and in further view of Tackett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,301).

Independent claim 1, as presented herein, recites in part as follows:

“substituting means, having a number of word substitute dictionaries, for substituting a word or words included in the text with a word or words from the number of word substitute dictionaries **in accordance with personality information**....” (Underlining and bold added for emphasis.)

In describing the above 103 rejection, the Examiner appears to have relied upon Holm (and, in particular, lines 7-11 of column 9 thereof) to disclose the substituting means of claim 1. See, for example, lines 15-18 of page 5 of the present Office Action. It is respectfully submitted that the portion of Holm relied upon by the Examiner (hereinafter, merely “Holm”) does not disclose the substituting means as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is believed that

claim 1 is distinguishable from the applied combination of Sadakuni, Holm, and Tackett. For somewhat similar reasons, it is also believed that independent claims 10 and 11 are distinguishable from the applied combination of Sadakuni, Holm, and Tackett. Claims 2-5 and 7-9 are dependent from amended independent claim 1 and due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Sadakuni, Holm, and Tackett for at least the reasons previously described.

New claims 12-14 are dependent from one of the amended independent claims and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from the applied combination of Sadakuni, Holm, and Tackett for at least the reasons previously described. Further, each of these claims recite “wherein the personality information is representative of one or more of the following items: type, gender, age, temperament, or physical condition.”


In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference or references, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith
to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800